

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE
Transcriber's Office
FLOOR DEBATE

March 8, 2004

LR 14

economy. And I don't know where people are getting this information. I think it's preposterous. And you know, there have been a number of studies done on our state and what would happen if we did allow casino gambling in this state, and they range in numbers from a low of \$50 million in Ernie Goss' study, to \$150 million to \$207 million in another study, to yet a higher figure even of like about \$274 million in another study. Nobody knows which one of those is right, but it is not going to be some kind of a net drain on our economy. I think that the poll that was handed out to you which was taken last week is a...or week before, actually, now, is a good indication that people have heard enough about this issue, both in the Legislature, in the media, on the airwaves, on the talk shows. I think everybody would just like an opportunity to vote on this issue, whether they support gambling or not. They'd just like to vote on it and be done with it for a while. And I would encourage my colleague Senator Smith to think about that and to give us the opportunity to vote on the motion to substitute and then the actual amendment itself. Thank you, Mr. President and members.

SPEAKER BROMM: Thank you, Senator Schimek. Senator Friend.

SENATOR FRIEND: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Members of the Legislature, it seems like we've visited a couple of these topics this morning. I rise a little bit, as far as the lottery is concerned, I rise in support of the motion to substitute. I, like Senator Chambers, find Senator Smith's actions somewhat maybe entry-level masterful. Let's put it that way. I'm enjoying this. I think the terminology I've used before is, God help me, I do love it so. The...what I'd like to point out, from a procedural standpoint, I think others can probably speak a little clearer to this than I can, this issue obviously is worn out. If that has anything to do with the motion to substitute and the amount of debate we've had on here, don't forget that we also have a solid amount of debate on Senator Janssen's issue, which was pretty open-ended...Senator Janssen's resolution, it was pretty open-ended. Moving on to the arguments that I guess philosophically are opposed to the resolution, one of the things that was brought up was representation. We are the representatives of the people. And